EXHIBIT E1

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT BRIDGEPORT DIVISION

In Re * Case No. 22-50073 (JAM)

*

HO WAN KWOK and GENEVER HOLDINGS CORPORATION,

*

Debtor.

LUC A. DESPINS, * Adv. Proc. No. 22-05027

*

Plaintiff,

×

*

BRAVO LUCK, LIMITED, et al.,

*

Defendant.

LUC A. DESPINS, * Adv. Proc. No. 23-05017

1100. 1100. 100. 25 05017

* Bridgeport, Connecticut Plaintiff, * August 29, 2023

*

*

TAURUS FUND, LLC, et al.,

*

Defendants. *

*

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE HONORABLE JULIE A. MANNING
UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

V.

V.

Chapter 11 Trustee: LUC A. DESPINS, ESQ.

Paul Hastings LLP 200 Park Avenue New York, NY 10166

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript produced by transcription service.

APPEARANCES: (Cont'd)

For the Chapter 11 Trustee: PATRICK R. LINSEY, ESQ.

Neubert Pepe and Monteith 195 Church Street, 13th Floor

New Haven, CT 06510

For U.S. Trustee: HOLLEY L. CLAIBORN, ESQ.

Office of U.S. Trustee

The Giaimo Federal Building 150 Court Street, Room 302

New Haven, CT 06510

For the Creditors Committee: IRVE J. GOLDMAN, ESQ.

> Pullman & Comley 850 Main Street

Bridgeport, CT 06601

FRANCIS J. LAWALL, ESQ. For Bravo Luck:

Troutman Pepper Hamilton

Sanders, LLP

3000 Two Logan Square 18th and Arch Street Philadelphia, PA 19103

For Hing Chi Ngok and CHRISTOPHER J. MAJOR, ESQ. Greenwich Land, LLC:

Meister Seelig & Fein LLP

125 Park Avenue New York, NY 10017

For Taurus Fund, LLC: MICHAEL T. CONWAY, ESQ.

Lazare Potter Giacovas &

Moyle, LLP

747 Third Avenue New York, NY 10017

1 held the status conference with regard to that matter.

The only other thing the U.S. Trustee's Office may want, I have no idea, Attorney Claiborn, but that motion that's seeking to remediate different issues at the Sherry-Netherland apartment also seeks the employment. So I don't know if you want the order to refer to Section 327 or something too. I have no idea. But maybe you can all work that out before we have a hearing.

And maybe if you all come in and there's no problem, you'll go first at 2 p.m. Okay?

MR. DESPINS: That's a good incentive.

THE COURT: All right. So with regard to the status conference that was held today that -- the status conference has been held. There's no need for any -- no further status conferences will be scheduled and a notice of hearing will issue on ECF No. 2113. Okay?

So then how would you like to proceed next?

MR. DESPINS: We'll go to Mahwah at this point.

THE COURT: Go right ahead.

MR. DESPINS: Thank you, Your Honor.

So Your Honor, this is a motion to approve a settlement with the Department of Justice. That's under document 24 in the adversary proceeding. And I have already testified as to this, but I think it's important that we set the stage again on this because last time that was not the

Fiore Reporting and Transcription Service, Inc.

main focus. I wanted the Court to know about it, but clearly that was not the purpose of that hearing.

So the first question is why enter into a settlement with the DOJ? Second question is what does the settlement do or not do? And so let me try to address that.

The first question is why?

As we state in the motion, the DOJ has expressly targeted the Mahwah mansion as a -- that's not a verb -- forfeitable asset and they've actually identified that asset. We did not know about it. So we have to be candid with the Court. We did not know about that asset until the indictment was released.

And, however, the Department of Justice, their tools are sort of limited in the pre-conviction phase in the sense that they cannot obtain title to this property now or do much with it before there's a conviction, which is a final conviction. Given that the trial is not going to last — not going to start until April I think, at least until April of next year, obviously, the DOJ and we were aware of what was going there and we're really concerned about this very valuable asset being left in limbo for lack of a better term.

So, however, because they identified this asset as a potentially forfeitable asset, we did not want to begin any adversary proceeding which could be perceived as hostile

towards the DOJ because obviously it's important we believe to work with them as cooperatively as possible. Why?

Because they have all sorts of tools that we don't have. We don't want them to be fighting us and us being at cross purposes with them with respect to this asset, and this is where we came up with this idea of -- first of all, we did our homework. We believe that this asset through the relief we're seeking in the adversary proceeding is an estate asset. We're convinced of that. The Court will have to determine if that's the case or not. That's for another day.

But we approached the DOJ and said we want to go forward with this adversary proceeding to try to establish that this is an asset of the estate. And eventually, if the Court rules in our favor, to sell this asset to liquidate it for the benefit of holders of allowed claims.

And so we had this discussion about, okay, how is that going to play out, because their view is that they have superior claims. And I'm not going to go into all the details on this, but we pointed out and we cited in the motion some case law, because there's a lot of cases on this where Chapter 11 trustees or Chapter 7 trustees are battling against the DOJ over issues like that as to who has first dibs on an asset of the -- and I'm saying in those cases the alleged wrongdoer -- and, you know, obviously we want to

1 avoid that.

And we also wanted to avoid the following, which is we filed this adversary proceeding. In my dreams, we prevail. We sell the assets and the DOJ comes in and says thank you very much, we will take that money, and thank you for your work, and that's the end of it. We could not have that.

This estate cannot be in a position where it's financing any other activity. It has to net neutral. And I believe move than net neutral, and I'll get to that piece in a second. So that we negotiated the fact that if we prevail, that's very important, only if we prevail.

This settlement agreement does not dictate the sale of the property because it provides that certain things will happen if we prevail.

So if we prevail and we sell the asset, we can use the net proceeds to pay all the expenses that the estate will have incurred. At that time, we thought we would incur not only legal fees, but security fees, a broker to sell the property, a mortgage if -- there's no mortgage on the property, but if there are people that have mechanics liens that need to be paid, that of course comes off the top.

So that creates a concept of net proceeds. And the net proceeds under that stipulation, we're kicking down -- that down the road, which is to be determined. And I'll

Fiore Reporting and Transcription Service, Inc.

come back to why there's not more progress on that. So the net proceeds are very important.

And what I said is, okay, that's great. We're going to get all our expenses back. That's good. But this case is not being run for the professionals for the case. There has to be a benefit to the estate. That's where we came in with the deemed expense of a million dollars.

So that assuming for a second that we prevail, the mansion is sold, we get all the expenses paid, and the DOJ and us cannot agree on the distribution of the net proceeds, we're getting a million dollars to the estate guaranteed. And it says in there to be paid to the holders of allowed claims, so an allowed claim in your court, so it has to be an allowed claim, allowed claims of victims. And, you know, people pointed out, well, victims is not defined.

That's not an accident. Meaning, I want to have a shot at convincing the DOJ that the victims -- first of all, you have to have an allowed claim. You cannot receive a penny of this unless you have an allowed claim as determined by Your Honor. But if you have an allowed claim, the issue of who's a victim or not, that's -- I would like that to be subject to further discussion.

But the bottom line is this estate will end up with a million positive, if we're right that this property is part of the estate. And we feel pretty strongly that is

the case, but of course Your Honor will have to rule on that.

So the estate is not worse off because the fees and expenses are covered. It's better off by a million dollars. And it can be better off by a lot more than that if we are successful in convincing the DOJ that the distribution of proceeds from this property -- and by the way, we're going to try that with other -- you know, for example, I've mentioned the cash that's being frozen right now, \$630 million we -- that's not today's issue, but the game plan here, based on other cases where the DOJ has sought and obtained forfeiture of assets, is for the Chapter 11 Trustee to wear two hats, Chapter 11 Trustee and forfeiture receiver. And it all comes back to this court for distribution.

And I know there are issues there. And they know that too, meaning the DOJ. They're not naive. They know that.

The question is, okay, who's a victim? In their book, a victim might be only the victim of certain alleged schemes. But, you know, I can see that there are other people in this case that Mr. Goldman represents that also are victims.

For example, Bru Ma(ph), you don't know her, but I'm using her as an example, because if you ever read her